arXiv:1610.09729v2 [math.RT] 3 Nov 2016

# Restricting Specht modules of cyclotomic Hecke algebras

ANDREW MATHAS

ABSTRACT. This paper proves that the restriction of a Specht module for a (degenerate or non-degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebra, or KLR algebra, of type $A$ has a Specht filtration.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known and classical result in the semisimple representation theory of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$, for $n \geq 1$, that the restriction of a Specht module is the direct sum of Specht modules indexed by certain partitions of $n-1$. In general, only the weaker result holds that the restriction of a Specht module has a filtration by smaller Specht modules. That is, a filtration such that each subquotient is isomorphic to a Specht module.

All of these results generalise to the cyclotomic Hecke algebras of type $A$, which are certain deformations of the group algebra of the complex reflection group $\mathfrak{S}_n \wr (\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$, for $n, \ell \geq 1$. In the semisimple case, the restriction of a Specht module for a cyclotomic Hecke algebra was described by Ariki and Koike [3] using seminormal forms [3]. In the non-semisimple case, the corresponding restriction theorem exists in the literature [4, Proposition 1.9], however, the proof given in [4] (and repeated in [23, Proposition 6.1]), is incomplete. Ariki [2, Lemma 13.2] has proved the weaker statement in the Grothendieck groups. Using the Murphy basis of the Specht module $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ for $\mathscr{H}_n$ it is easy to construct an explicit $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-module filtration of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ that looks like a Specht filtration of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. Unfortunately, as Goodman[1] points out, it is not obvious that the subquotients in this filtration are isomorphic to Specht modules. This note gives a self-contained proof that the restriction of a Specht module has a Specht filtration (see Theorem 4.1 for a more precise statement), thus fixing a gap in the literature.

Brundan, Kleshchev and Wang [10, Theorem 4.11] extended the Specht module restriction theorem to the graded setting, where this result is an important ingredient in the proof of the Ariki-Brundan-Kleshchev categorification theorem [9, Theorem 5.14]. The proof of the graded restriction theorem given in [10] uses, in an essential way, the construction in [4]. Moreover, the arguments of [10] only apply in the non-degenerate case and they require the ground-ring to be a field. We prove the graded restriction theorem for graded Specht modules of the cyclotomic KLR algebras of type $A$ defined over an integral domain, thus recovering and extending the results of [10].

The corresponding results for inducing Specht modules can be found in [16, 24, 26].

**Acknowledgements.** I thank Fred Goodman for alerting me to the gap in the published proofs of the restriction formula and Liron Speyer for many comments and corrections and for asking me about the graded restriction formula for the graded Specht modules of the cyclotomic KLR algebras. This research was partially supported by the Australian Research Council.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20C08, 20C30, 05E10.
*Key words and phrases.* Cyclotomic Hecke algebras, Specht modules, representation theory.
This research was supported, in part, by the Australian Research Council.

[1] Personal communication. See also [12, Appendix A].

## 2. Ariki-Koike algebras

This section introduces the cyclotomic Hecke algebras of type $A$. Throughout this note we fix positive integers $\ell$ and $n$ and let $\mathfrak{S}_n$ be the symmetric group of degree $n$. For $1 \le r < n$ let $s_r = (r, r+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. Then $s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}$ are the standard Coxeter generators of $\mathfrak{S}_n$.

We use a slight variation on Ariki and Koike's original definition of the cyclotomic Hecke algebras of type $A$; compare with [3, Definition 3.1] and [6, Definition 2.1]. The advantage of the definition below is that it allows us to treat the so-called degenerate and non-degenerate cases simultaneously, which correspond to $\xi^2 = 1$ an $\xi^2 \ne 1$, respectively. Previously these cases were treated separately.

Fix a commutative integral domain $\mathcal{A}$, with one.

2.1. **Definition** (Hu-Mathas [17, Definition 2.2]). *The **cyclotomic Hecke algebra of type** $A$, with **Hecke parameter** $\xi \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and **cyclotomic parameters** $Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell \in \mathcal{A}$, is the unital associative $\mathcal{A}$-algebra $\mathscr{H}_n = \mathscr{H}_n^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathscr{H}_n(\mathcal{A}, \xi, Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell)$ with generators $L_1, \dots, L_n$, $T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}$ and relations*

$$\prod_{l=1}^{\ell}(L_1 - Q_l) = 0, \qquad (T_r + \xi^{-1})(T_r - \xi) = 0, \qquad L_{r+1} = T_r L_r T_r + T_r,$$
$$L_r L_t = L_t L_r, \qquad T_r T_s = T_s T_r \text{ if } |r-s| > 1,$$
$$T_s T_{s+1} T_s = T_{s+1} T_s T_{s+1}, \qquad T_r L_t = L_t T_r \text{ if } t \ne r, r+1,$$

*where $1 \le r < n$, $1 \le s < n-1$ and $1 \le t \le n$.*

The arguments of Ariki and Koike [3, Theorem 3.10] show that $\mathscr{H}_n$ is free as an $\mathcal{A}$-module with basis $\{L_1^{a_1} \dots L_n^{a_n} T_w \mid 0 \le a_1, \dots, a_n < \ell \text{ and } w \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$. where $T_w = T_{i_1} \dots T_{i_k}$ if $w = s_{r_1} \dots s_{r_k} \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is a reduced expression (that is, $k$ is minimal).

The Ariki-Koike basis theorem implies that there is a natural embedding of $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$ in $\mathscr{H}_n$ and that $\mathscr{H}_n$ is free as an $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-module of rank $\ell n$. If $M$ is an $\mathscr{H}_n$-module let

$$\operatorname{Res} M : \mathscr{H}_n\text{-Mod} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_{n-1}\text{-Mod}$$

be the restriction functor from category of $\mathscr{H}_n$-modules to $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-modules. The functor Res is exact.

The algebra $\mathscr{H}_n$ has another basis that is better adapted to the representation theory of $\mathscr{H}_n$. Recall that a partition of $n$ is a weakly decreasing sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \dots)$ of non-negative integers such that $|\lambda| = \sum_i \lambda_i = n$. A **multipartition**, or $\ell$-partition, of $n$ is an ordered $\ell$-tuple $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)})$ of partitions such that $|\boldsymbol{\lambda}| = |\lambda^{(1)}| + \dots + |\lambda^{(\ell)}| = n$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_n = \mathcal{P}_{\ell,n}$ be the set of multipartitions of $n$. If $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ then $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ **dominates** $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, written $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\mu}$, if

$$\sum_{c=1}^{k-1} |\lambda^{(c)}| + \sum_{r=1}^{s} \lambda_r^{(k)} \ge \sum_{c=1}^{k-1} |\mu^{(c)}| + \sum_{r=1}^{s} \mu_r^{(k)},$$

for $1 \le k \le \ell$ and for all $s \ge 1$. Dominance is a partial order on $\mathcal{P}_n$.

Identify a multipartition $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ with its **diagram**, which is the set of nodes

$$\{(l, r, c) \mid 1 \le \lambda_r^{(l)} \le c \text{ and } 1 \le l \le \ell\}.$$

More generally a **node** is any element of $\{1, \dots, \ell\} \times \mathbb{N}^2$, which we order lexicographically. We picture the diagram of a multipartition as an array of boxes in the plane, allowing us to talk of the components, rows and columns of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. For example, if $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (3, 2|1^3|2^2)$ then

$\boldsymbol{\lambda} =$ 

has three components and $\lambda^{(2)} = (1^3)$ has three rows and one column.

A **removable** node of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is any node $\rho \in \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}-\rho := \boldsymbol{\lambda} \setminus \{\rho\}$ is (the diagram of) a multipartition. Write $\boldsymbol{\mu} \to \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is obtained from $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by removing a removable node. Similarly, a node $\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is an **addable** node if $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cup \{\alpha\}$ is a multipartition.

The removable nodes of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ are totally ordered by the lexicographic order. As a consequence, the set of multipartitions $\{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \,|\, \boldsymbol{\mu} \to \boldsymbol{\lambda}\}$ is totally ordered by dominance.

If $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ then a $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableau is a function $\mathtt{t} : \boldsymbol{\lambda} \longrightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Write $\mathrm{Shape}(\mathtt{t}) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ If $\mathtt{t}$ is a $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableau. For convenience, identify $\mathtt{t} = (\mathtt{t}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathtt{t}^{(\ell)})$ with a labeling of the diagram $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by elements of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ in the obvious way. In this way we talk of the rows, columns and components of $\mathtt{t}$.

A **standard $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableau** is a $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableau $\mathtt{t}$ such that the entries in each row of $\mathtt{t}^{(k)}$ increase from left to right and the entries in each column of $\mathtt{t}^{(k)}$ increase from top to bottom, for $1 \le k \le \ell$. Let $\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ be the set of standard $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableaux and set $\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n) = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $\mathrm{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_n) = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \times \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$.

If $\mathtt{t}$ is a standard tableau and $1 \le m \le n$ let $\mathtt{t}_{\downarrow m}$ be the subtableau of $\mathtt{t}$ that contains the numbers $1, 2, \dots, m$. It is easy to see that $\mathtt{t}_{\downarrow m}$ is standard because $\mathtt{t}$ is standard. Extend the dominance ordering to $\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ by declaring that $\mathtt{s} \trianglerighteq \mathtt{t}$ if $\mathrm{Shape}(\mathtt{s}_{\downarrow m}) \trianglerighteq \mathrm{Shape}(\mathtt{t}_{\downarrow m})$, for $1 \le m \le n$. As we need it often, set $\mathtt{t}_{\downarrow} = \mathtt{t}_{\downarrow(n-1)}$.

Using the observations in last paragraph gives it is easy to verify the following combinatorial fact, which underpins all of the results in this note.

2.2. **Lemma.** *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then there is a bijection*

$$\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigsqcup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \\ \boldsymbol{\mu} \to \boldsymbol{\lambda}}} \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \qquad (\textit{disjoint union}),$$

*given by* $\mathtt{t} \mapsto \mathtt{t}_{\downarrow}$.

Let $\mathtt{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ be the unique standard $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableau such that $\mathtt{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \trianglerighteq \mathtt{t}$, for all $\mathtt{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. More explicitly. the entries in $\mathtt{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ increase from left to right, and then top to bottom, along its rows $\mathtt{t}^{\lambda^{(1)}}, \dots, \mathtt{t}^{\lambda^{(\ell)}}$. The symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$ acts on the tableaux with entries in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ by permuting their entries. If $\mathtt{t}$ is a standard $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-tableau let $d(\mathtt{t}) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ be the unique permutation such that $\mathtt{t} = \mathtt{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} d(\mathtt{t})$.

For each multipartition $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ define $m_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = u^+_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} x_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, where

$$u^+_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \prod_{s=2}^{\ell} \prod_{m=1}^{|\lambda^{(1)}|+\cdots+|\lambda^{(s-1)}|} (L_m - Q_s) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} \xi^{\ell(w)} T_w.$$

(This corrects definition of $u^+_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ given in [25, §1.5].) Define the **Murphy basis** element $m_{\mathtt{s}\mathtt{t}} = T^*_{d(\mathtt{s})} m_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T_{d(\mathtt{t})}$, for $\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. By [11, Theorem 3.26] and [5, Theorem 6.3],

$$\{m_{\mathtt{s}\mathtt{t}} \,|\, \mathtt{s}, \mathtt{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$$

is a cellular basis of $\mathscr{H}_n$, in the sense of Graham and Lehrer [13]. Consequently, if $\mathscr{H}_n^{\trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is the $\mathcal{A}$-module spanned by $\{m_{\mathtt{s}\mathtt{t}} \,|\, \mathtt{s}, \mathtt{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_n \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\mu} \trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\lambda}\}$, then $\mathscr{H}_n^{\trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathscr{H}_n$.

The main property of the Murphy basis that we need is the following result, which describes how the elements $L_1, \dots, L_n$ act upon the Murphy basis.

2.3. **Proposition** ( [18, Proposition 3.7] and [5, Lemma 6.6]). *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $\mathtt{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $1 \le m \le n$. Then*

$$m_{\mathtt{t}} L_m = c_m(\mathtt{t}) m_{\mathtt{t}} + \sum_{\mathtt{s} \trianglerighteq \mathtt{t}} r_{\mathtt{s}} m_{\mathtt{s}},$$

*for some $r_s \in \mathcal{A}$.*

The **Specht module** $S^{\boldsymbol\lambda}$ is the $\mathscr{H}_n$-submodule of $\mathscr{H}_n/\mathscr{H}_n^{\rhd\boldsymbol\lambda}$ generated by $m_{\boldsymbol\lambda}+\mathscr{H}_n^{\rhd\boldsymbol\lambda}$. It follows from the general theory of cellular algebras that $S^{\boldsymbol\lambda}$ is free as an $\mathcal{A}$-module with basis $\{m_{\mathfrak t}\mid \mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol\lambda)\}$, where $m_{\mathfrak t}=m_{\mathfrak t^{\boldsymbol\lambda}\mathfrak t}+\mathscr{H}_n^{\rhd\boldsymbol\lambda}$ for $\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol\lambda)$. We write $S^{\boldsymbol\lambda}=S^{\boldsymbol\lambda}_{\mathcal{A}}$ when we want to emphasize that $S^{\boldsymbol\lambda}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-module.

Let $M$ be an $\mathscr{H}_n$-module. Then $M$ has a **Specht filtration** if there exists a filtration

$$M=M_1\supset M_2\supset\cdots\supset M_z\supset M_{z+1}=0$$

and multipartitions $\boldsymbol\lambda_1,\dots,\boldsymbol\lambda_z$ such that $M_r/M_{r+1}\cong S^{\boldsymbol\lambda_r}$, for $r=1,\dots,z$. The main results of this paper say that if $\boldsymbol\lambda\in\mathcal{P}_n$ then restriction of $S^{\boldsymbol\lambda}$ to $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$ has a Specht filtration.

## 3. The semisimple case

The aim of this note is to understand how the Specht modules of the cyclotomic Hecke algebras of type $A$ behave under restriction. We start by considering the easiest case when $\mathscr{H}_n$ is semisimple and, equivalently, all of the Specht modules are irreducible. In this case, the Specht module restriction theorem is classical, building from Young's foundational work on the symmetric group [27] from 1901 to the results of Ariki and Koike [3]. We give the proof here both because it is not very difficult and because everything that follows builds upon this result.

First, we need to define content functions for tableaux. If $\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ is a standard tableaux and $1\le m\le n$ then the **content** of $m$ in $\mathfrak t$ is

$$c_m(\mathfrak t)=\xi^{2(c-r)}Q_l+[c-r]_\xi\quad\text{where}\quad(l,r,c)=\mathfrak t^{-1}(m).$$

The condition $(l,r,c)=\mathfrak t^{-1}(m)$ means that $m$ is in row $r$ and column $c$ of $\mathfrak t^{(l)}$.

The semisimplicity of $\mathscr{H}_n$ is determined by the **Poincaré polynomial**

$$P_{\mathscr{H}_n}=[1]_\xi[2]_\xi\dots[n]_\xi\prod_{1\le k<l\le\ell}\prod_{-n<m<n}(\xi^{2d}Q_k+[m]_\xi-Q_l)\in\mathcal{A}.$$

For symmetric groups the next result is well-known, with the extension to $\mathscr{H}_n$ being given by Ariki [1]. (The order of our exposition is misleading, however, because the most natural way to prove the equivalence of parts (a) and (b) in Proposition 3.1 is to use Theorem 3.2 below.)

3.1. **Proposition** (Ariki [1], Ariki, Mathas, Rui [5, Theorem 6.11])**.** *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a field. Then the following are equivalent:*

a) *The algebra $\mathscr{H}_n$ is semisimple*
b) *If $\mathfrak s,\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ then $\mathfrak s=\mathfrak t$ if and only if $c_m(\mathfrak s)=c_m(\mathfrak t)$ for $1\le m\le n$.*
c) *The polynomial $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}\ne0$.*

For the remainder of this section we assume that $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. If $\mathfrak s,\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ and $c_k(\mathfrak s)\ne c_k(\mathfrak t)$, for some $k$ with $1\le k\le n$, then $c_k(\mathfrak t)-c_k(\mathfrak s)$ divides $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}$, so it is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, if $\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ we can define

$$F_{\mathfrak t}=\prod_{m=1}^{n}\prod_{\substack{\mathfrak s\in\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)\\ c_m(\mathfrak s)\ne c_m(\mathfrak t)}}\frac{L_m-c_m(\mathfrak t)}{c_m(\mathfrak t)-c_m(\mathfrak s)}.$$

If $\mathfrak s,\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol\lambda)$ define $f_{\mathfrak s\mathfrak t}=F_{\mathfrak s}m_{\mathfrak s\mathfrak t}F_{\mathfrak t}$. Then $\{f_{\mathfrak s\mathfrak t}\}$ is a seminormal basis of $\mathscr{H}_n$. Moreover, we can completely describe the action of $\mathscr{H}_n$ upon this basis.

For the symmetric groups the following result goes back to Young [27]. For the Hecke algebras of types $A$ and $B$ this was first proved by Hoefsmit [14]. The general cyclotomic case was established by Ariki and Koike [3]. Here we follow the exposition of [17, 25].

3.2. **Theorem.** *Suppose that $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}\in\mathcal{A}^\times$. Then $\{f_{\mathfrak s\mathfrak t}\mid\mathfrak s,\mathfrak t\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol\lambda)$ for $\boldsymbol\lambda\in\mathcal{P}_n\}$ is a basis of $\mathscr{H}_n$ and the following hold:*

a) *If* $(\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t})\in \mathrm{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_n)$ *and* $1\le m\le n$ *then*

$$f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}L_m = c_m(\mathfrak{t})f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \quad \textit{and} \quad L_m f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} = c_m(\mathfrak{s})f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}.$$

b) *If* $(\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t})\in \mathrm{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_n)$ *and* $1\le r<n$ *then*

$$f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}T_r = \frac{1+(\xi-\xi^{-1})c_{r+1}(\mathfrak{t})}{c_{r+1}(\mathfrak{t})-c_r(\mathfrak{t})}f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} + \alpha_r(\mathfrak{t})f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{v}},$$

*where* $\mathfrak{v}=\mathfrak{t}(r,r+1)$ *and where*

$$\alpha_r(\mathfrak{t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \textit{if } \mathfrak{t}\rhd\mathfrak{v},\\ \frac{(1-\xi^{-1}c_r(\mathfrak{t})+\xi c_r(\mathfrak{v}))(1+\xi c_r(\mathfrak{t})-\xi^{-1}c_r(\mathfrak{v}))}{(c_r(\mathfrak{t})-c_r(\mathfrak{v}))(c_r(\mathfrak{v})-c_r(\mathfrak{t}))}, & \textit{otherwise}.\end{cases}$$

c) *If* $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathcal{P}_n$ *then* $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\mathscr{H}_n$*, for any* $\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$.

d) *If* $\mathcal{A}$ *is a field then* $\mathscr{H}_n$ *is a split semisimple algebra and* $\{S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mid\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathcal{P}_n\}$ *is a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible* $\mathscr{H}_n$*-modules.*

Seminormal forms are usually given only for Specht modules rather than the regular representation. Parts (a), (c) and (d) of Theorem 3.2 are contained in [17, Theorem 3.9], although most of the theorem can be deduced from results in [3, 5]. As shown in [17, Proposition 3.11], part (b) is a easy to establish because, by Proposition 2.3, if $(\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t})\in\mathrm{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_n)$ then

$$f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} = F_{\mathfrak{s}}m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}F_{\mathfrak{t}} = m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} + \sum_{(\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v})\in\mathrm{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_n)} r_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}}m_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}}, \qquad \text{for some } r_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}}\in\mathcal{A}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $r_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}}\neq 0$ only if either $\mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{u})\rhd\mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{s})$ or $(\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v})\neq(\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t})$, $\mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{u})=\mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{s})$ and $\mathfrak{u}\trianglerighteq\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{v}\trianglerighteq\mathfrak{t}$.

By part (c) of the theorem, $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\mathscr{H}_n$ for any $\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. The module $f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\mathscr{H}_n$ has basis $\{f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{v}}\mid\mathfrak{v}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$ and if $\mathfrak{u}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ then $f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\mathscr{H}_n\cong f_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{t}}\mathscr{H}_n$ with an isomorphism being given by $f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\mapsto f_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{t}}$ by Theorem 3.2. For the sake of definiteness, we identify $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with the right ideal $f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}}\mathscr{H}_n$ of $\mathscr{H}_n$, which has basis $\{f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}}\mid\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.2 we obtain the branching rule for the Specht modules in the semisimple case. Recall that $\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow=\mathfrak{t}_{\downarrow(n-1)}$, for $\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$.

3.4. **Corollary** (Ariki-Koike [3, Corollary 3.12])**.** *Suppose that* $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}\in\mathcal{A}^\times$ *and fix a multipartition* $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathcal{P}_n$*. Then*

$$\mathrm{Res}\,S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\\ \boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$$

*as* $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$*-modules. An explicit isomorphism is given by* $f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}}\mapsto f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow}$*, where* $\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\mu}=\mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow)$.

*Proof.* As above, we may assume that $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has basis $\{f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}}\mid\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$. If $\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}_{n-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ let $S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ be the vector subspace of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with basis $\{f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}}\mid\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\}$. By Lemma 2.2, there are vector space isomorphisms

$$S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\\ \boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\\ \boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}},$$

where the second isomorphism is determined by $f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}}\mapsto f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow}$, for $\mathfrak{t}\in\mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and where $\boldsymbol{\mu}=\mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow)$. By parts (a)–(c) of Theorem 3.2, this map restricts to an isomorphism $S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ of $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-modules whenever $\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}_{n-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. We are done. □

As we have shown, Corollary 3.4 holds whenever $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, this result does not require the coefficient ring to be a field.

## 4. The non-semisimple case

This section proves the first main theorem of this note, which is the restriction theorem for the Specht modules over an arbitrary ring. This generalises the branching rules, Corollary 3.4, for semisimple case. The difference is that when $P_{\mathscr{H}_n}$ is invertible then $\operatorname{Res} S^\lambda$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of "smaller" Specht modules whereas, in general, the restriction of a Specht modules will have a Specht filtration.

The next result appears in the literature as [4, Proposition 1.9], however, the proof given there is incomplete. The first paragraph of the argument below is similar to the incomplete proof given in [4]. The remaining paragraphs fill in the missing details from the argument from [4] by showing that the subquotients in the filtration constructed in the proof are isomorphic to Specht modules.

4.1. **Theorem.** *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and let $A_1 > \cdots > A_z$ be the removable nodes of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, ordered lexicographically. Then $\operatorname{Res} S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has an $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-module filtration*

$$0 = S^{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset S^{1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset S^{2,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \cdots \subset S^{z,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = 0$$

*such that $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cong S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}-A_r}$ for $1 \le r \le z$*

*Proof.* Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r = \boldsymbol{\lambda} - A_r$, for $1 \le r \le z$. Then $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_z\} = \{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu} \to \boldsymbol{\lambda}\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \rhd \cdots \rhd \boldsymbol{\mu}_z$. Recall from Section 2 that $\{m_\mathfrak{t} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$ is a basis of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. Motivated by the proof of Corollary 3.4, for $1 \le r \le z$ define $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ to be the $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with basis $\{m_\mathfrak{t} \mid \operatorname{Shape}(\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow) \trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\mu}_r\}$ and set $S^{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = 0$. Then $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has an $\mathcal{A}$-module filtration

$$0 = S^{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset S^{1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset S^{2,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \cdots \subset S^{z,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = 0.$$

We claim that this is the required $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-module filtration of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. By Proposition 2.3, if $1 \le r \le z$ then the $\mathcal{A}$-module $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is stable under the action of $L_1, \dots, L_n$. As remarked in [4], it is possible to show that $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is an $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-module using [11, Proposition 3.18] (in the cases when $\xi^2 \ne 1$), however, we will prove this directly below.

Fix $r$ with $1 \le r \le z$. To complete the proof of the theorem it is enough to show that $S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_r} \cong S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ as $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-modules. Let $\theta_r : S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \longrightarrow S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_r}$ be the unique $\mathcal{A}$-linear map such that

$$\theta_r(m_\mathfrak{t} + S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = m_{\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow}, \qquad \text{for } \mathfrak{t} \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ with } \mathfrak{t}_\downarrow \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_r).$$

By Lemma 2.2, $\theta_r$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-module isomorphism. We claim that $\theta_r$ is an isomorphism of $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-modules.

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}, q_1, \dots, q_\ell]$, where $v, q_1, \dots, q_\ell$ are indeterminates over $\mathbb{Z}$, and consider the Hecke algebra $\mathscr{H}_n^{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathscr{H}_n(\mathcal{Z}, v, q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$. Then $\mathscr{H}_n \cong \mathscr{H}_n^{\mathcal{Z}} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{A}$ and $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{A}} \cong S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{Z}} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{A}$, where we consider $\mathcal{A}$ as a $\mathcal{Z}$-module by letting $v$ act as multiplication by $\xi$ and $q_k$ as multiplication by $Q_k$, for $1 \le k \le \ell$. Similarly, let $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}_{n-1}$ be the obvious subalgebra of $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ such that $\mathscr{H}_{n-1} \cong \mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}_{n-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{A}$. By definition, the map $\theta_r$ commutes with base change. Therefore, in order to show that $\theta_r$ is an $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-module homomorphism it is enough to consider the case when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{Z}$. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(v, q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ be the field of fractions of $\mathcal{Z}$. Then $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}} \cong S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{Z}} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Z}$, so by considering $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ as a $\mathcal{Z}$-submodule of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ it follows that $\theta_r$ is a homomorphism of $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{Z}}_{n-1}$-modules if and only if the induced map $\theta_r \otimes 1_{\mathcal{K}}$ over $\mathcal{K}$ is a homomorphism of $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{K}}_{n-1}$-modules. Hence, we are reduced to the case when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{K}$.

Assume now that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathscr{H}_n = \mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{K}}_n$. For $\mathfrak{t} \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ set $f_\mathfrak{t} = f_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}} + \mathscr{H}_n^{\rhd\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. Then $\{f_\mathfrak{t} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$ is a basis of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. By (3.3), if $\mathfrak{t} \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ then

$$f_\mathfrak{t} = m_\mathfrak{t} + \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \rhd \mathfrak{t}} a_\mathfrak{s} m_\mathfrak{s} \qquad \text{for some } a_\mathfrak{s} \in \mathcal{K}.$$

Consequently, $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ has basis $\{f_\mathfrak{t} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \operatorname{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ and } \operatorname{Shape}(\mathfrak{t}) \trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\mu}_r\}$. In particular, $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is an $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-submodule of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ by Theorem 3.2. Although we do not need this, this also

implies that $S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}} \cong S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_r\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}} \oplus \cdots \oplus S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ as $\mathscr{H}_{n-1}$-modules, where we use the notation from the proof of Corollary 3.4,

By Corollary 3.4 the $\mathcal{K}$-module isomorphism determined by

$$\theta : S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\\ \boldsymbol{\mu}\to\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\mathcal{K}}; f_{\mathfrak{t}} \mapsto f_{\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow},$$

is an isomorphism of $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{K}}_{n-1}$-modules. Moreover, since the transition matrix between the Murphy basis $\{m_{\mathfrak{t}}\}$ and the seminormal basis $\{f_{\mathfrak{t}}\}$ of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is unitriangular, it follows by downwards induction on dominance that $\theta(m_{\mathfrak{t}}) = m_{\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow}$, for all $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. By the last paragraph, $\theta$ induces an $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{K}}_{n-1}$-homomorphism $\hat{\theta}_r : S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}/S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}} \longrightarrow S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_r}_{\mathcal{K}}$ given by

$$\hat{\theta}_r(f_{\mathfrak{t}} + S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \theta(f_{\mathfrak{t}}) = f_{\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow}, \qquad \text{for } \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ with } \mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_r.$$

Therefore, $\hat{\theta}_r(m_{\mathfrak{t}} + S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}) = \theta(m_{\mathfrak{t}}) = m_{\mathfrak{t}_\downarrow} = \theta_r(m_{\mathfrak{t}} + S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}})$. Hence, $\theta_r = \hat{\theta}_r$ is an $\mathscr{H}^{\mathcal{K}}_n$-module homomorphism as we wanted to show. This implies that $S^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_r}_{\mathcal{K}} \cong S^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}/S^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ as so completes the proof. □

In the level one case (that is, when $\ell = 1$), a more complicated proof of Theorem 4.1, which was sketched by the author, can be found in [**12**, Appendix A].

## 5. Graded Specht modules

In this final section we consider the analogue of Theorem 4.1 for the graded Specht modules of the corresponding cyclotomic KLR (quiver) Hecke algebra $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$. The quiver Hecke algebras are a family of $\mathbb{Z}$-graded algebras that arise in the categorification of quantum groups. For quivers of type $A$, Brundan and Kleshchev [**9**] have shown that over a field the cyclotomic quiver Hecke algebras are isomorphic to the cyclotomic Hecke algebras.

Let us quickly set the notation. Fix $e \in \{2,3,4,\ldots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ and let $\Gamma_e$ be the quiver with vertex set $I = \mathbb{Z}/e\mathbb{Z}$ (we set $e\mathbb{Z} = \{0\}$ when $e = \infty$), and with edges $i \to i+1$, for $i \in I$. To the quiver $\Gamma_e$ we attach the standard Lie theoretic data of a Cartan matrix $(c_{ij})_{i,j\in I}$, fundamental weights $\{\Lambda_i \,|\, i \in I\}$, positive weights $P^+ = \sum_{i\in I} \mathbb{N}\Lambda_i$, positive roots $Q^+ = \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathbb{N}\alpha_i$ and we let $(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the bilinear form determined by

$$(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = c_{ij} \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\Lambda_i, \alpha_j) = \delta_{ij}, \qquad \text{for } i,j \in I.$$

Let $Q^+_n = \{\beta \in Q^+ \,|\, \sum_{i\in I}(\Lambda_i, \beta) = n\}$ an set $I^\beta = \{\mathbf{i} \in I^n \,|\, \beta = \alpha_{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_n}\}$ for $\beta \in Q^+_n$.

A **graded module** or, more accurately a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded module, is a module $M$ with a decomposition $M = \bigoplus_{d\in\mathbb{Z}} M_d$ such that each summand $M_d$ is finite dimensional. A graded algebra is an algebra $A = \bigoplus_d A_d$ that is a graded module such that $A_cA_d \subseteq A_{c+d}$, for all $c,d \in \mathbb{Z}$. A graded $A$-module is an $A$-module that is graded and $M_cA_d \subseteq M_{c+d}$, for all $c,d \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $M$ is a graded $A$-module let $\underline{M}$ be the module obtained by forgetting the grading. If $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $q^sM$, where $q$ is an indeterminate, be the graded $A$-module obtained by shifting the grading by $s$, so that $(q^sM)_d = M_{d-s}$. Two graded $A$-modules are isomorphic if there is a degree preserving isomorphism between them. For example, $M \cong q^sM$ if and only if $s = 0$.

5.1. **Definition.** *Fix $e \in \{2,3,4,\ldots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ and suppose that $\Lambda \in P^+$ and $\beta \in Q^+$. The **cyclotomic quiver Hecke algebra** $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_\beta$ is the unital associative $\mathcal{A}$-algebra with generators*

$$\{\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_{n-1}\} \cup \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \cup \{e(\mathbf{i}) \,|\, \mathbf{i} \in I^\beta\}$$

*and relations*

$$y_1^{(\Lambda,\alpha_{i_1})}e(\mathbf{i}) = 0, \qquad e(\mathbf{i})e(\mathbf{j}) = \delta_{\mathbf{ij}}e(\mathbf{i}), \qquad \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I^\beta} e(\mathbf{i}) = 1,$$
$$y_re(\mathbf{i}) = e(\mathbf{i})y_r, \qquad \psi_re(\mathbf{i}) = e(s_r\cdot\mathbf{i})\psi_r, \qquad y_ry_s = y_sy_r,$$

$$\psi_r y_{r+1} e(\mathbf{i}) = (y_r\psi_r + \delta_{i_r i_{r+1}})e(\mathbf{i}), \qquad y_{r+1}\psi_r e(\mathbf{i}) = (\psi_r y_r + \delta_{i_r i_{r+1}})e(\mathbf{i}),$$
$$\psi_r y_s = y_s \psi_r, \qquad \text{if } s \neq r, r+1,$$
$$\psi_r \psi_s = \psi_s \psi_r, \qquad \text{if } |r-s| > 1,$$
$$\psi_r^2 e(\mathbf{i}) = Q_{i_r i_{r+1}}(y_r, y_{r+1})e(\mathbf{i}),$$
$$(\psi_r\psi_{r+1}\psi_r - \psi_{r+1}\psi_r\psi_{r+1})e(\mathbf{i}) = \delta_{i_r, i_{r+2}} \frac{Q_{i_{r+2}i_{r+1}}(y_{r+2}, y_{r+1}) - Q_{i_r i_{r+1}}(y_r, y_{r+1})}{y_{r+2} - y_r}$$

*for* $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in I^\beta$ *and all admissible* $r$ *and* $s$ *and where*

$$Q_{ij}(u,v) = \begin{cases} (u-v)(v-u), & \text{if } i \leftrightarrows j, \\ (u-v), & \text{if } i \to j, \\ (v-u), & \text{if } i \leftarrow j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*For* $n \geq 0$, *define* $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda = \bigoplus_{\beta \in Q_n^+} \mathscr{R}_\beta^\Lambda$.

The algebra $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded algebra with degree function determined by

$$\deg e(\mathbf{i}) = 0, \quad \deg y_r = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \deg \psi_s e(\mathbf{i}) = (\alpha_{i_r}, \alpha_{i_{r+1}}),$$

for $\mathbf{i} \in I^n$, $1 \leq r \leq n$ and $1 \leq r < n$.

Inspecting the relations in Definition 5.1, $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$ has a unique anti-isomorphism $\diamond$ that fixes each of the generators.

To connect these algebras with the cyclotomic Hecke algebras, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ set

$$[k] = \begin{cases} \xi + \xi^3 + \cdots + \xi^{2k-1}, & \text{if } k \geq 0, \\ -\xi^{2k}[-k], & \text{if } k < 0, \end{cases}$$

Let $e \in \{2, 3, 4, \ldots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ be minimal such that $[e] = 0$, or set $e = \infty$ if $[k] \neq 0$ for $k > 0$.

For $\Lambda \in P^+$ choose a **multicharge** $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_\ell)$ such that

$$(\Lambda, \alpha_i) = \#\{1 \leq k \leq \ell \,|\, \kappa_k \equiv i \pmod e\} \qquad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

Let $\mathscr{H}_n^\Lambda$ be the cyclotomic Hecke algebra with parameters $Q_r = [\kappa_r]$, for $1 \leq r \leq \ell$. The algebra $\mathscr{H}_n^\Lambda$ depends only on $\Lambda$ and not on the choice of multicharge.

5.2. **Theorem** (Brundan and Kleshchev [8]). *Suppose that* $\mathcal{A}$ *is a field. Then* $\mathscr{H}_n^\Lambda \cong \mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$.

The isomorphism of Theorem 5.2 holds only over a field even though the cyclotomic KLR algebra $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$ is defined over any ring. For each $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ there is a graded Specht module $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ such that $\underline{\mathbb{S}}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cong S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ as (ungraded) $\mathscr{H}_n^\Lambda$-modules. To define these, and to prove a graded version of Theorem 4.1, we need some notation.

Fix $i \in I$. A node $A = (l, r, c)$ is an $i$-node if $i = \kappa_l + c - r + e\mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, if $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$ then the $e$-**residue** of $k$ in $\mathfrak{t}$ is

$$\mathrm{res}_k(\mathfrak{t}) = \kappa_l + c - r + e\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{if} \quad \mathfrak{t}(l, r, c) = k.$$

The **residue sequence** of $\mathfrak{t}$ is $\mathrm{res}(\mathfrak{t}) = (\mathrm{res}_1(\mathfrak{t}), \ldots, \mathrm{res}_n(\mathfrak{t})) \in I^n$. Set $\mathbf{i}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathrm{res}(\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$.

For $i \in I$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ let $\mathrm{Add}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ be the set of addable $i$-nodes for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and let $\mathrm{Rem}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ be the set of removable $i$-nodes. Order $\mathrm{Add}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $\mathrm{Rem}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ lexicographically by $<$.

5.3. **Definition** (Brundan, Kleshchev and Wang [10, §3.5]). *Suppose that* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ *and let* $A$ *be an addable or removable* $i$*-node of* $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. *Define integers*

$$d_A^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \#\{B \in \mathrm{Add}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,|\, B > A\} - \#\{B \in \mathrm{Rem}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,|\, B > A\},$$
$$d_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^A = \#\{B \in \mathrm{Add}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,|\, B < A\} - \#\{B \in \mathrm{Rem}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,|\, B < A\}.$$

*If* $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *define the* ***degree*** *of* $\mathfrak{t}$ *inductively by setting*

$$\deg \mathfrak{t} = \begin{cases} \deg \mathfrak{t}_{\downarrow} + d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_A, & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$$

*where* $A = \mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n)$ *is the node containing* $n$ *in* $\mathfrak{t}$.

Following [15, Definition 4.9], for $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ define $d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_k = \deg \mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\downarrow k} - \deg \mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\downarrow(k-1)}$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Define $e^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = e(\mathbf{i}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ and $y^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = y_1^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_1} y_2^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_2} \dots y_n^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n}$. For $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ set

$$\psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} = \psi^{\diamond}_{d(\mathfrak{s})} e^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} y^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \psi_{d(\mathfrak{t})},$$

where for each $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ we fix an arbitrary reduced expression $w = s_{r_1} \dots s_{r_k}$ and define $\psi_w = \psi_{r_1} \dots \psi_{r_k} \in \mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$. In general, the elements $\{\psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\}$ depend upon the choices of reduced expression for the elements of $\mathfrak{S}_n$. By definition, $(\psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}})^{\diamond} = \psi_{\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{s}}$.

Hu and the author [15] proved that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a field then $\{\psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\}$ is a graded cellular basis of $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$, in the sense of [15]. In fact, this result holds over an arbitrary ring.

5.4. **Theorem** (Ge Li [21, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Suppose that* $\Lambda \in P^+$ *and let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be an integral domain. Then* $\{\psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *for some* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ *is a graded cellular basis of* $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$*. In particular,* $\deg \psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} = \deg \mathfrak{s} + \deg \mathfrak{t}$*, for* $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Exactly as in Section 2, we now define the graded Specht modules although we need to be slightly careful to choose the "correct" grading shift. In more detail, if $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ let $\mathscr{R}^{\rhd\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ be the submodule of $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$ spanned by $\{\psi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu} \rhd \boldsymbol{\lambda}\}$. Then $\mathscr{R}^{\rhd\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$. The **graded Specht module**a is the $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$-module

$$\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = q^{-\deg \mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} (\psi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} + \mathscr{R}^{\rhd\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n.$$

Set $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}} = \psi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\mathfrak{t}} + \mathscr{R}^{\rhd\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. Then $\{\psi_{\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$ is a homogeneous basis of $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, where the grading is given by $\deg \psi_{\mathfrak{t}} = \deg \mathfrak{t}$, for $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. By Theorem 5.4, the Specht module $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is defined over an arbitrary ring. The integral graded Specht module can also be defined using [20], which gives homogeneous relations for the graded Specht modules.

Importantly, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a field then $\underline{\mathbb{S}}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cong S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ as (ungraded) $\mathscr{H}^{\Lambda}_n$-modules, for all $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, so it is natural to ask for a graded analogue of Theorem 4.1. In the non-degenerate case, and when working over a field, this result appears as Brundan, Kleshchev and Wang [10, Theorem 4.11], however, their proof relies on the arguments of [4]. We give a self-contained proof of this result that applies over an arbitrary integral domain.

5.5. **Theorem.** *Suppose that* $\mathcal{A}$ *is an integral domain,* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ *and let* $A_1 > \dots > A_z$ *be the removable nodes of* $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$*, ordered lexicographically. Then* $\mathrm{Res}\,\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ *has an* $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_{n-1}$*-module filtration*

$$0 = \mathbb{S}^{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \mathbb{S}^{1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \dots \subset \mathbb{S}^{z-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \mathbb{S}^{z,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathrm{Res}\,\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$$

*such that* $\mathbb{S}^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\mathbb{S}^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cong q^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{A_r}} \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}-A_r}$*, for* $1 \le r \le z$.

The special case of Theorem 5.5 when $\mathcal{A}$ is a field, and $e$ is not equal to the characteristic, recovers [10, Theorem 4.11].

*Proof.* The proof follows the same strategy as the proof of Theorem 4.1. For $1 \le r \le n$ let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r = \boldsymbol{\lambda} - A_r$ and define $\mathbb{S}^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ to be the $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with basis

$$\{\psi_{\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathrm{Shape}(\mathfrak{t}_{\downarrow}) \trianglerighteq \boldsymbol{\mu}_r\}.$$

Then, as an $\mathcal{A}$-module, $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has a filtration $0 = \mathbb{S}^{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \mathbb{S}^{1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \dots \subset \mathbb{S}^{z,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. By Lemma 2.2 and Definition 5.3, there are graded $\mathcal{A}$-module isomorphisms

$$\theta_r : \mathbb{S}^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\mathbb{S}^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \longrightarrow q^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{A_r}} \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}-A_r}; \psi_{\mathfrak{t}} + \mathbb{S}^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mapsto \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{\downarrow}}$$

for $1 \le r \le z$. By definition, $\theta_r$ is homogeneous, however, it is not clear that it is an $\mathscr{R}^{\Lambda}_n$-module homomorphism.

Fix $r$ with $1 \le r \le z$. We claim that $\theta_r$ is an isomorphism of graded $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$-modules. By Theorem 5.4, or [20, Corollary 6.24], $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{A}} \cong \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A}$. By definition, $\theta_r$ commutes with base change so it is enough to prove the theorem in the special case when $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\xi$ be a primitive $e$th root of unity, or an indeterminate over $\mathbb{Q}$ if $e = \infty$, and let $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(\xi)$. Then $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ embeds in $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}} \cong \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{K}$, so it is enough to prove the theorem over $\mathcal{K}$. Now, by Theorem 5.2, $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{K} \cong \mathscr{H}_n^{\mathcal{K}}$, so we are reduced to showing that $\theta_r$ is an $\mathscr{H}_n^{\mathcal{K}}$-module homomorphism. To complete the proof we need one more observation: by [10, Proposition 4.5], or [15, Lemma 5.4], there exist non-zero scalars $c_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$\psi_{\mathfrak{t}} = c_{\mathfrak{t}} m_{\mathfrak{t}} + \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{v} \in \mathrm{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\ \mathfrak{v} \rhd \mathfrak{t}}} r_{\mathfrak{v}} m_{\mathfrak{v}}, \qquad \text{for } r_{\mathfrak{v}} \in \mathcal{K}.$$

That is, the transition matrix between the $\psi$-basis of $S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the Murphy basis is triangular. It follows that the map $\theta_r$, defined above, coincides exactly with the map $\theta_r$ defined in the proof of Theorem 4.1. In particular, $\theta_r$ is a (homogeneous) $\mathscr{H}_n^{\mathcal{K}}$-module homomorphism, as we needed to show. □

5.6. *Remarks.*

a) The argument above proves Theorem 5.5 by reducing to the situation considered in Theorem 4.1 that, in turn, reduces to the semisimple case of Corollary 3.4. Using the framework developed in [17] it is possible to deduce Theorem 5.5 directly from Corollary 3.4.

b) In the special case when $\mathcal{A}$ is a field, Theorem 5.5 can be deduced almost directly from Theorem 4.1 since the transition matrix between the $\psi$-basis and the Murphy basis of the Specht module is unitriangular. We use the integral form of $\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ in the proof of Theorem 5.5 only to obtain the result over an arbitrary integral domain.

c) Because of Definition 2.1, the proof of Theorem 5.5 simultaneously treats both the degenerate and non-degenerate cases. Only the non-degenerate case was considered in [10].

Fix $i \in I$. If $\mathbf{j} \in I^{n-1}$ let $\mathbf{j} \vee i = (j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}, i) \in I^n$ and define

$$e_{n-1,i} = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I^{n-1}} e(\mathbf{j} \vee i) \in \mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda.$$

Using the relations, and Theorem 5.2, there is a non-unital homogeneous algebra embedding $\mathscr{R}_{n-1}^\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$ given by

$$e(\mathbf{j}) \mapsto e(\mathbf{j} \vee i), \quad y_r \mapsto e_{n-1,i} y_r, \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_s \mapsto e_{n-1,i} \psi_s,$$

for $\mathbf{j} \in I^{n-1}$, $1 \le r < n$ and $1 \le s < n-1$. If $i \in I$ and $M$ is an $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$-module define $i\text{-Res}\, M = M e_{n-1,i}$. Then there is an isomorphism of functors

$$\mathrm{Res} \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} i\text{-Res}$$

corresponding to the identity $1_{\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda} = \sum_{i \in I} e_{n-1,i}$. By [7, 8, 22], the blocks of $\mathscr{R}_{n-1}^\Lambda$ are labelled by $Q_{n-1}^+$. For $\beta \in Q_{n-1}^+$ let $\mathcal{P}_\beta = \{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \mid \mathbf{i}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in I^\beta\}$.

Applying the idempotent $e_{n-1,i}$ to Theorem 5.5 gives the following:

5.7. **Corollary.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an integral domain. Suppose that $i \in I$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta+\alpha_i}$, where $\beta \in Q_{n-1}^+$. Let $B_1 > \cdots > B_y$ be the removable $i$-nodes of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, ordered lexicographically. Then $i\text{-Res}\, \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has an $\mathscr{R}_\beta^\Lambda$-module filtration*

$$0 = \mathbb{S}^{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \mathbb{S}^{2,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \cdots \subset \mathbb{S}^{y-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \subset \mathbb{S}^{y,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = i\text{-Res}\, \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$$

*such that $\mathbb{S}^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\mathbb{S}^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cong q^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{B_r}} \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}-B_r}$ as $\mathscr{R}_\beta^\Lambda$-modules, for $1 \le r \le y$.*

Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a field and let $\mathcal{I}_q^n$ be the free $\mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}]$-module with basis $\{\mathbf{i}\,|\,\mathbf{i}\in I^n\}$. The **formal character** of a graded $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$-module $M$ is

$$\mathrm{ch_q}\, M = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I^n} \dim_q Me(\mathbf{i})\cdot \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_q^n$$

By [19, Theorem 3.17], taking $q$-characters defines an injective map Grothendieck group of $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$ to $\mathcal{I}_q^n$. Using the notation from the proof of Theorem 5.5, if $1\le r\le z$ then $\mathrm{ch_q}(\mathbb{S}^{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\mathbb{S}^{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_r}$. Therefore,

$$[i\text{-Res}\, S^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}] = \sum_{r=1}^{y} q^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{B_r}} [\mathbb{S}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}-B_r}].$$

This is all that is needed in [9].

Finally, the papers [16, 20] also define **dual graded Specht modules** $\mathbb{S}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathcal{P}_n$. These modules can be defined in exactly the same way as the graded Specht modules using a "dual" $\psi'$-basis of $\mathscr{R}_n^\Lambda$. This allows all of the arguments in this section to be repeated, essentially word-for-word, to prove analogues of the results in this section for the dual graded Specht modules. We state only the analogue of Corollary 5.7 and leave the details to the reader.

5.8. **Corollary.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an integral domain. Suppose that $i\in I$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathcal{P}_{\beta+\alpha_i}$, where $\beta\in Q^+_{n-1}$. Let $B_y>\cdots>B_1$ be the removable $i$-nodes of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, ordered lexicographically. Then $i$-Res $\mathbb{S}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ has an $\mathscr{R}_\beta^\Lambda$-module filtration*

$$0=\mathbb{S}_{0,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\subset\mathbb{S}_{1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\subset\cdots\subset\mathbb{S}_{y-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\subset\mathbb{S}_{y,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}=0$$

*such that $\mathbb{S}_{r,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\mathbb{S}_{r-1,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\cong q^{d^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{B_r}}\mathbb{S}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}-B_r}$ as $\mathscr{R}_\beta^\Lambda$-modules, for $1\le r\le y$.*

Rather than repeating the arguments of this section, Corollary 5.8 can be deduced directly from Corollary 5.7 using either Theorem 7.27 or Theorem 8.5 of [20]. These two results show that, up to a degree shift, the graded Specht modules and dual graded Specht modules are interchanged by two dualities on the module categories of the KLR algebras.

## References


[1] S. Ariki, *On the semi-simplicity of the Hecke algebra of $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z})\wr\mathfrak{S}_n$*, J. Algebra, **169** (1994), 216–225. [Page 4.]

[2] ———, *Representations of quantum algebras and combinatorics of Young tableaux*, University Lecture Series, **26**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. Translated from the 2000 Japanese edition and revised by the author. [Page 1.]

[3] S. Ariki and K. Koike, *A Hecke algebra of $(\mathbf{Z}/r\mathbf{Z})\wr\mathfrak{S}_n$ and construction of its irreducible representations*, Adv. Math., **106** (1994), 216–243. [Pages 1, 2, 4, and 5.]

[4] S. Ariki and A. Mathas, *The number of simple modules of the Hecke algebras of type $G(r,1,n)$*, Math. Z., **233** (2000), 601–623. [Pages 1, 6, and 9.]

[5] S. Ariki, A. Mathas, and H. Rui, *Cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras*, Nagoya Math. J., **182** (2006), 47–134. (Special issue in honour of George Lusztig), arXiv:math/0506467. [Pages 3, 4, and 5.]

[6] M. Broué and G. Malle, *Zyklotomische Heckealgebren*, Astérisque, **212** (1993), 119–189. Représentations unipotentes génériques et blocs des groupes réductifs finis. [Page 2.]

[7] J. Brundan, *Centers of degenerate cyclotomic Hecke algebras and parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$*, Represent. Theory, **12** (2008), 236–259. [Page 10.]

[8] J. Brundan and A. Kleshchev, *Blocks of cyclotomic Hecke algebras and Khovanov-Lauda algebras*, Invent. Math., **178** (2009), 451–484. [Pages 8 and 10.]

[9] ———, *Graded decomposition numbers for cyclotomic Hecke algebras*, Adv. Math., **222** (2009), 1883–1942. [Pages 1, 7, and 11.]

[10] J. Brundan, A. Kleshchev, and W. Wang, *Graded Specht modules*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **655** (2011), 61–87. arXiv:0901.0218. [Pages 1, 8, 9, and 10.]

[11] R. Dipper, G. James, and A. Mathas, *Cyclotomic $q$-Schur algebras*, Math. Z., **229** (1998), 385–416. [Pages 3 and 6.]

[12] J. Enyang and F. M. Goodman, *Cellular bases for algebras with a Jones basic construction*, 2011. arXiv:1106.5339. [Pages 1 and 7.]

[13] J. J. Graham and G. I. Lehrer, *Cellular algebras*, Invent. Math., **123** (1996), 1–34. [Page 3.]

[14] P. N. HOEFSMIT, *Representations of Hecke algebras of finite groups with BN-pairs of classical types*, PhD thesis, University of British Columbia, 1974. [Page 4.]
[15] J. HU AND A. MATHAS, *Graded cellular bases for the cyclotomic Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras of type A*, Adv. Math., **225** (2010), 598–642. arXiv:0907.2985. [Pages 9 and 10.]
[16] ———, *Graded induction for Specht modules*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, **2012** (2012), 1230–1263. arXiv:1008.1462. [Pages 1 and 11.]
[17] ———, *Seminormal forms and cyclotomic quiver Hecke algebras of type A*, Math. Ann., **364** (2016), 1189–1254. arXiv:1304.0906. [Pages 2, 4, 5, and 10.]
[18] G. JAMES AND A. MATHAS, *The Jantzen sum formula for cyclotomic $q$-Schur algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **352** (2000), 5381–5404. [Page 3.]
[19] M. KHOVANOV AND A. D. LAUDA, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups III*, 2008, preprint. arXiv:0807.3250. [Page 11.]
[20] A. KLESHCHEV, A. MATHAS, AND A. RAM, *Universal graded Specht modules for cyclotomic Hecke algebras*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3), **105** (2012), 1245–1289. arXiv:1102.3519. [Pages 9, 10, and 11.]
[21] G. LI, *Integral Basis Theorem of cyclotomic Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras of Type A*, J. Algebra, 2017, accepted Oct. 2016. arXiv:1412.3747. [Page 9.]
[22] S. LYLE AND A. MATHAS, *Blocks of cyclotomic Hecke algebras*, Adv. Math., **216** (2007), 854–878. arXiv:math/0607451. [Page 10.]
[23] A. MATHAS, *Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group*, University Lecture Series, **15**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999. [Page 1.]
[24] ———, *A Specht filtration of an induced Specht module*, J. Algebra, **322** (2009), 893–902. [Page 1.]
[25] ———, *Cyclotomic quiver Hecke algebras of type A*, in Modular representation theory of finite and $p$-adic groups, G. W. Teck and K. M. Tan, eds., National University of Singapore Lecture Notes Series, **30**, World Scientific, 2015, ch. 5, 165–266. arXiv:1310.2142. [Pages 3 and 4.]
[26] S. RYOM-HANSEN, *Grading the translation functors in type A*, J. Algebra, **274** (2004), 138–163. [Page 1.]
[27] A. YOUNG, *On Quantitative Substitutional Analysis I*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **33** (1900), 97–145. [Page 4.]

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS F07, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, NSW 2006, AUSTRALIA.
*E-mail address*: andrew.mathas@sydney.edu.au